arXiv:1407.0280v3 [math.CA] 9 Apr 2015

ON THE PRODUCT OF FUNCTIONS IN BMO AND H^1 OVER SPACES OF HOMOGENEOUS TYPE

LUONG DANG KY

Abstract. Let $\mathcal{X}$ be an RD-space, which means that $\mathcal{X}$ is a space of homogeneous type in the sense of Coifman-Weiss with the additional property that a reverse doubling property holds in $\mathcal{X}$. The aim of the present paper is to study the product of functions in BMO and H^1 in this setting. Our results generalize some recent results in [4] and [10].

1. Introduction and statement of main results

A famous result of C. Fefferman state that $BMO(\mathbb{R}^n)$ is the dual space of $H^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$. Although, for $f \in BMO(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and $g \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$, the point-wise product fg may not be an integrable function, one (see [2]) can view the product of f and g as a distribution, denoted by $f \times g$. Such a distribution can be written as the sum of an integrable function and a distribution in a new Hardy space, so-called Hardy space of Musielak-Orlicz type (see [1, 8]). A complete study about the product of functions in BMO and $\mathcal{H}^1$ has been firstly done by Bonami, Iwaniec, Jones and Zinsmeister [2]. Recently, Li and Peng [10] generalized this study to the setting of Hardy and BMO spaces associated with Schrödinger operators. In particular, Li and Peng showed that if $L = -\Delta + V$ is a Schrödinger operator with the potential V belongs to the reverse Hölder class RH_q for some $q \geq n/2$, then one can view the product of $b \in BMO_L(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and $f \in H^1_L(\mathbb{R}^n)$ as a distribution $b \times f$ which can be written the sum of an integrable function and a distribution in $H^{\wp}_L(\mathbb{R}^n, d\mu)$. Here $H^{\wp}_L(\mathbb{R}^n, d\mu)$ is the weighted Hardy-Orlicz space associated with L, related to the Orlicz function $\wp(t) = t/\log(e+t)$ and the weight $d\nu(x) = dx/\log(e+|x|)$. More precisely, they proved the following.

Theorem A. *For each $f \in H^1_L(\mathbb{R}^n)$, there exist two bounded linear operators $\mathscr{L}_f : BMO_L(\mathbb{R}^n) \to L^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and $\mathscr{H}_f : BMO_L(\mathbb{R}^n) \to H^{\wp}_L(\mathbb{R}^n, d\nu)$ such that for every $b \in BMO_L(\mathbb{R}^n)$,*

$$b \times f = \mathscr{L}_f(b) + \mathscr{H}_f(b).$$

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 42B35, 32A35.

Key words and phrases. Musielak-Orlicz function, Hardy space, BMO, space of homogeneous type, admissible function, atomic decomposition, maximal function.

Let $(\mathcal{X}, d, \mu)$ be a space of homogeneous type in the sense of Coifman-Weiss. Following Han, Müller and Yang [7], we say that $(\mathcal{X}, d, \mu)$ is an *RD-space* if μ satisfies *reverse doubling property*, i.e., there exists a constant $C > 1$ such that for all $x \in \mathcal{X}$ and $r > 0$,

$$\mu(B(x, 2r)) \geq C\mu(B(x, r)).$$

A typical example for such RD-spaces is the Carnot-Carathéodory space with doubling measure. We refer to the seminal paper of Han, Müller and Yang [7] (see also [5, 6, 12, 13]) for a systematic study of the theory of function spaces in harmonic analysis on RD-spaces.

Let $(\mathcal{X}, d, \mu)$ be an RD-space. Recently, in analogy with the classical result of Bonami-Iwaniec-Jones-Zinsmeister, Feuto proved in [4] that:

Theorem B. *For each $f \in H^1(\mathcal{X})$, there exist two bounded linear operators $\mathscr{L}_f : BMO(\mathcal{X}) \to L^1(\mathcal{X})$ and $\mathscr{H}_f : BMO(\mathcal{X}) \to H^{\wp}(\mathcal{X}, d\nu)$ such that for every $b \in BMO(\mathcal{X})$,*

$$b \times f = \mathscr{L}_f(b) + \mathscr{H}_f(b).$$

Here the weight $d\nu(x) = d\mu(x)/\log(e + d(x_0, x))$ with $x_0 \in \mathcal{X}$ and the Orlicz function $\wp$ is as in Theorem A. It should be pointed out that in [4], for $f = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \lambda_j a_j$, the author defined the distribution $b \times f$ as

$$b \times f := \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \lambda_j (b - b_{B_j}) a_j + \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \lambda_j b_{B_j} a_j \tag{1.1}$$

by proving that the second series is convergent in $H^{\wp}(\mathcal{X}, d\nu)$. This is made possible by the fact that $H^{\wp}(\mathcal{X}, d\nu)$ is complete and is continuously imbedded into the space of distributions $(\mathcal{G}_0^{\epsilon}(\beta, \gamma))'$ (see Section 2), which is not established in [4]. Moreover one has to prove that Definition (1.1) does not depend on the atomic decomposition of f. In this paper, we give a definition for the distribution $b \times f$ (see Section 3) which is similar to that of Bonami-Iwaniec-Jones-Zinsmeister.

Our first main result can be read as follows.

Theorem 1.1. *For each $f \in H^1(\mathcal{X})$, there exist two bounded linear operators $\mathscr{L}_f : BMO(\mathcal{X}) \to L^1(\mathcal{X})$ and $\mathscr{H}_f : BMO(\mathcal{X}) \to H^{\log}(\mathcal{X})$ such that for every $b \in BMO(\mathcal{X})$,*

$$b \times f = \mathscr{L}_f(b) + \mathscr{H}_f(b).$$

Here $H^{\log}(\mathcal{X})$ is the *Musielak-Orlicz Hardy space* related to the Musielak-Orlicz function $\varphi(x, t) = \frac{t}{\log(e+d(x_0,x))+\log(e+t)}$ (see Section 2). Theorem 1.1 is an improvement of Theorem B since $H^{\log}(\mathcal{X})$ is a proper subspace of $H^{\wp}(\mathcal{X}, d\nu)$.

Let ρ be an *admissible function* (see Section 2). Recently, Yang and Zhou [12, 13] introduced and studied Hardy spaces and Morrey-Campanato spaces related to the function ρ. There, they established that $BMO_{\rho}(\mathcal{X})$ is the dual

space of $H^1_\rho(\mathcal{X})$. Similar to the classical case, we can define the product of functions $b \in BMO_\rho(\mathcal{X})$ and $f \in H^1_\rho(\mathcal{X})$ as distributions $b \times f \in (\mathcal{G}_0^\epsilon(\beta,\gamma))'$.

Our next main result is as follows.

Theorem 1.2. *For each $f \in H^1_\rho(\mathcal{X})$, there exist two bounded linear operators $\mathscr{L}_{\rho,f} : BMO_\rho(\mathcal{X}) \to L^1(\mathcal{X})$ and $\mathscr{H}_{\rho,f} : BMO_\rho(\mathcal{X}) \to H^{\log}(\mathcal{X})$ such that for every $b \in BMO_\rho(\mathcal{X})$,*

$$b \times f = \mathscr{L}_{\rho,f}(b) + \mathscr{H}_{\rho,f}(b).$$

When $\mathcal{X} \equiv \mathbb{R}^n, n \geq 3$, and $\rho(x) \equiv \sup\{r > 0 : \frac{1}{r^{n-2}} \int_{B(x,r)} V(y)dy \leq 1\}$, where $L = -\Delta + V$ is as in Theorem A, one has $BMO_\rho(\mathcal{X}) \equiv BMO_L(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and $H^1_\rho(\mathcal{X}) \equiv H^1_L(\mathbb{R}^n)$. So, Theorem 1.2 is an improvement of Theorem A since $H^{\log}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ is a proper subspace of $H^\wp_L(\mathbb{R}^n, d\nu)$ (see [9]).

The following conjecture is suggested by A. Bonami and F. Bernicot.

Conjecture. *There exist two bounded bilinear operators $\mathscr{L} : BMO(\mathcal{X}) \times H^1(\mathcal{X}) \to L^1(\mathcal{X})$ and $\mathscr{H} : BMO(\mathcal{X}) \times H^1(\mathcal{X}) \to H^{\log}(\mathcal{X})$ such that*

$$b \times f = \mathscr{L}(b,f) + \mathscr{H}(b,f).$$

It should be pointed out that when $\mathcal{X} = \mathbb{R}^n$ and $H^{\log}(\mathcal{X})$ is replaced by $H^\wp(\mathbb{R}^n, d\nu)$, the above conjecture is just Conjecture 1.7 of [2], which answered recently by Bonami, Grellier and Ky [1] (see also [9]).

Throughout the whole paper, C denotes a positive geometric constant which is independent of the main parameters, but may change from line to line. We write $f \sim g$ if there exists a constant $C > 1$ such that $C^{-1}f \leq g \leq Cf$.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we present some notations and preliminaries about BMO type spaces and Hardy type spaces on RD-spaces. Section 3 is devoted to prove Theorem 1.1. Finally, we give the proof for Theorem 1.2 in Section 4.

Acknowledgements. The author would like to thank Aline Bonami, Sandrine Grellier, Dachun Yang and Frédéric Bernicot for very useful suggestions.

2. Some preliminaries and notations

Let d be a quasi-metric on a set $\mathcal{X}$, that is, d is a nonnegative function on $\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{X}$ satisfying

(a) $d(x,y) = d(y,x)$,
(b) $d(x,y) > 0$ if and only if $x \neq y$,
(c) there exists a constant $\kappa \geq 1$ such that for all $x, y, z \in \mathcal{X}$,

$$d(x,z) \leq \kappa(d(x,y) + d(y,z)). \tag{2.1}$$

A trip $(\mathcal{X}, d, \mu)$ is called a *space of homogeneous type* in the sense of Coifman-Weiss [3] if μ is a regular Borel measure satisfying *doubling property*, i.e. there exists a constant $C > 1$ such that for all $x \in \mathcal{X}$ and $r > 0$,

$$\mu(B(x,2r)) \leq C\mu(B(x,r)).$$

Following Han, Müller and Yang [7], $(\mathcal{X}, d, \mu)$ is called an *RD-space* if $(\mathcal{X}, d, \mu)$ is a space of homogeneous type and μ also satisfies *reverse doubling property*, i.e. there exists a constant $C > 1$ such that for all $x \in \mathcal{X}$ and $r > 0$,

$$\mu(B(x, 2r)) \geq C\mu(B(x, r)).$$

Set $\mathrm{diam}(\mathcal{X}) := \sup_{x,y\in\mathcal{X}} d(x, y)$. It should be pointed out that $(\mathcal{X}, d, \mu)$ is an RD-space if and only if there exist constants $0 < \mathfrak{d} \leq \mathfrak{n}$ and $C > 1$ such that for all $x \in \mathcal{X}$, $0 < r < \mathrm{diam}(\mathcal{X})/2$, and $1 \leq \lambda < \mathrm{diam}(\mathcal{X})/(2r)$,

$$C^{-1}\lambda^{\mathfrak{d}}\mu(B(x, r)) \leq \mu(B(x, \lambda r)) \leq C\lambda^{\mathfrak{n}}\mu(B(x, r)). \tag{2.2}$$

Here and what in follows, for $x, y \in \mathcal{X}$ and $r > 0$, we denote $V_r(x) := \mu(B(x, r))$ and $V(x, y) := \mu(B(x, d(x, y)))$.

Definition 2.1. *Let $x_0 \in \mathcal{X}$, $r > 0$, $0 < \beta \leq 1$ and $\gamma > 0$. A function f is said to belong to the space of test functions, $\mathcal{G}(x_0, r, \beta, \gamma)$, if there exists a positive constant C_f such that*

(i) $|f(x)| \leq C_f \frac{1}{V_r(x_0)+V(x_0,x)} \Big(\frac{r}{r+d(x_0,x)}\Big)^{\gamma}$ *for all* $x \in \mathcal{X}$;

(ii) $|f(x) - f(y)| \leq C_f \Big(\frac{d(x,y)}{r+d(x_0,x)}\Big)^{\beta} \frac{1}{V_r(x_0)+V(x_0,x)} \Big(\frac{r}{r+d(x_0,x)}\Big)^{\gamma}$ *for all* $x, y \in \mathcal{X}$ *satisfying that* $d(x, y) \leq \frac{r+d(x_0,x)}{2\kappa}$.

For any $f \in \mathcal{G}(x_0, r, \beta, \gamma)$, we define

$$\|f\|_{\mathcal{G}(x_0,r,\beta,\gamma)} := \inf\{C_f : (i) \text{ and } (ii) \text{ hold}\}.$$

Let ρ be a positive function on $\mathcal{X}$. Following Yang and Zhou [13], the function ρ is said to *be admissible* if there exist positive constants C_0 and k_0 such that for all $x, y \in \mathcal{X}$,

$$\rho(y) \leq C_0[\rho(x)]^{1/(1+k_0)}[\rho(x) + d(x, y)]^{k_0/(1+k_0)}.$$

Throughout the whole paper, we always assume that $\mathcal{X}$ is an RD-space with $\mu(\mathcal{X}) = \infty$, and ρ is an admissible function on $\mathcal{X}$. Also we fix $x_0 \in \mathcal{X}$.

In Definition 2.1, it is easy to see that $\mathcal{G}(x_0, 1, \beta, \gamma)$ is a Banach space. For simplicity, we write $\mathcal{G}(\beta, \gamma)$ instead of $\mathcal{G}(x_0, 1, \beta, \gamma)$. Let $\epsilon \in (0, 1]$ and $\beta, \gamma \in (0, \epsilon]$, we define the space $\mathcal{G}_0^{\epsilon}(\beta, \gamma)$ to be the completion of $\mathcal{G}(\epsilon, \epsilon)$ in $\mathcal{G}(\beta, \gamma)$, and denote by $(\mathcal{G}_0^{\epsilon}(\beta, \gamma))'$ the space of all continuous linear functionals on $\mathcal{G}_0^{\epsilon}(\beta, \gamma)$. We say that f is a *distribution* if f belongs to $(\mathcal{G}_0^{\epsilon}(\beta, \gamma))'$.

Remark that, for any $x \in \mathcal{X}$ and $r > 0$, one has $\mathcal{G}(x, r, \beta, \gamma) = \mathcal{G}(x_0, 1, \beta, \gamma)$ with equivalent norms, but of course the constants are depending on x and r.

Let f be a distribution in $(\mathcal{G}_0^{\epsilon}(\beta, \gamma))'$. We define *the grand maximal functions* $\mathcal{M}(f)$ and $\mathcal{M}_{\rho}(f)$ as following

$$\mathcal{M}(f)(x) := \sup\{|\langle f, \varphi\rangle| : \varphi \in \mathcal{G}_0^{\epsilon}(\beta, \gamma), \|\varphi\|_{\mathcal{G}(x,r,\beta,\gamma)} \leq 1 \text{ for some } r > 0\},$$

$$\mathcal{M}_{\rho}(f)(x) := \sup\{|\langle f, \varphi\rangle| : \varphi \in \mathcal{G}_0^{\epsilon}(\beta, \gamma), \|\varphi\|_{\mathcal{G}(x,r,\beta,\gamma)} \leq 1 \text{ for some } r \in (0, \rho(x))\}.$$

Let $L^{\log}(\mathcal{X})$ (see [1, 8] for details) be the Musielak-Orlicz type space of μ-measurable functions f such that

$$\int_{\mathcal{X}} \frac{|f(x)|}{\log(e+|f(x)|)+\log(e+d(x_0,x))}d\mu(x)<\infty.$$

For $f\in L^{\log}(\mathcal{X})$, we define the "norm" of f as

$$\|f\|_{L^{\log}}=\inf\left\{\lambda>0:\int_{\mathcal{X}}\frac{\frac{|f(x)|}{\lambda}}{\log(e+\frac{|f(x)|}{\lambda})+\log(e+d(x_0,x))}d\mu(x)\le 1\right\}.$$

Definition 2.2. *Let $\epsilon\in(0,1)$ and $\beta,\gamma\in(0,\epsilon)$.*

(i) The Hardy space $H^1(\mathcal{X})$ is defined by

$$H^1(\mathcal{X})=\{f\in(\mathcal{G}_0^\epsilon(\beta,\gamma))':\|f\|_{H^1}:=\|\mathcal{M}(f)\|_{L^1}<\infty\}.$$

(ii) The Hardy space $H^1_\rho(\mathcal{X})$ is defined by

$$H^1_\rho(\mathcal{X})=\{f\in(\mathcal{G}_0^\epsilon(\beta,\gamma))':\|f\|_{H^1_\rho}:=\|\mathcal{M}_\rho(f)\|_{L^1}<\infty\}.$$

(iii) The Hardy space $H^{\log}(\mathcal{X})$ is defined by

$$H^{\log}(\mathcal{X})=\{f\in(\mathcal{G}_0^\epsilon(\beta,\gamma))':\|f\|_{H^{\log}}:=\|\mathcal{M}(f)\|_{L^{\log}}<\infty\}.$$

It is clear that $H^1(\mathcal{X})\subset H^1_\rho(\mathcal{X})$ and $H^1(\mathcal{X})\subset H^{\log}(\mathcal{X})$ with the inclusions are continuous. It should be pointed out that the Musielak-Orlicz Hardy space $H^{\log}(\mathcal{X})$ is a proper subspace of the weighted Hardy-Orlicz space $\mathcal{H}^\wp(\mathcal{X},\nu)$ studied in [4]. We refer to [8] for an introduction to Musielak-Orlicz Hardy spaces on the Euclidean space $\mathbb{R}^n$.

Definition 2.3. *Let $q\in(1,\infty]$.*

(i) A measurable function $\mathfrak{a}$ is called an (H^1,q)-atom related to the ball $B(x,r)$ if
(a) supp $\mathfrak{a}\subset B(x,r)$,
(b) $\|\mathfrak{a}\|_{L^q}\le(V_r(x))^{1/q-1}$,
(c) $\int_{\mathcal{X}}\mathfrak{a}(y)d\mu(y)=0$.

(ii) A measurable function $\mathfrak{a}$ is called an (H^1_ρ,q)-atom related to the ball $B(x,r)$ if $r\le 2\rho(x)$ and $\mathfrak{a}$ satisfies (a) and (b), and when $r<\rho(x)$, $\mathfrak{a}$ also satisfies (c).

The following results were established in [5, 13].

Theorem 2.1. *Let $\epsilon\in(0,1)$, $\beta,\gamma\in(0,\epsilon)$ and $q\in(1,\infty]$. Then, we have:*

(i) The space $H^1(\mathcal{X})$ coincides with the Hardy space $H^{1,q}_{\rm at}(\mathcal{X})$ of Coifman-Weiss. More precisely, $f\in H^1(\mathcal{X})$ if and only if f can be written as $f=$

$\sum_{j=1}^{\infty}\lambda_j a_j$ *where the* a_j*'s are* (H^1,q)*-atoms and* $\{\lambda_j\}_{j=1}^{\infty}\in\ell^1$*. Moreover,*

$$\|f\|_{H^1}\sim\inf\left\{\sum_{j=1}^{\infty}|\lambda_j|:f=\sum_{j=1}^{\infty}\lambda_j a_j\right\}.$$

(ii) $f\in H^1_\rho(\mathcal{X})$ *if and only if* f *can be written as* $f=\sum_{j=1}^{\infty}\lambda_j a_j$ *where the* a_j*'s are* (H^1_ρ,q)*-atoms and* $\{\lambda_j\}_{j=1}^{\infty}\in\ell^1$*. Moreover,*

$$\|f\|_{H^1_\rho}\sim\inf\left\{\sum_{j=1}^{\infty}|\lambda_j|:f=\sum_{j=1}^{\infty}\lambda_j a_j\right\}.$$

Here and what in follows, for any ball $B\subset\mathcal{X}$ and $g\in L^1_{\rm loc}(\mathcal{X})$, we denote by g_B the average value of g over the ball B and denote

$$MO(g,B):=\frac{1}{\mu(B)}\int\limits_B|g(x)-g_B|d\mu(x).$$

Recall (see [3]) that a function $f\in L^1_{\rm loc}(\mathcal{X})$ is said to be in $BMO(\mathcal{X})$ if

$$\|f\|_{BMO}=\sup_B MO(f,B)<\infty,$$

where the supremum is taken all over balls $B\subset\mathcal{X}$.

Definition 2.4. *Let* ρ *be an admissible function and* $\mathcal{D}:=\{B(x,r)\subset\mathcal{X}:r\geq\rho(x)\}$*. A function* $f\in L^1_{\rm loc}(\mathcal{X})$ *is said to be in* $BMO_\rho(\mathcal{X})$ *if*

$$\|f\|_{BMO_\rho}=\|f\|_{BMO}+\sup_{B\in\mathcal{D}}\frac{1}{\mu(B)}\int\limits_B|f(x)|d\mu(x)<\infty.$$

The following results are well-known, see [3, 5, 12].

Theorem 2.1. *(i) The space* $BMO(\mathcal{X})$ *is the dual space of* $H^1(\mathcal{X})$*.*
(ii) The space $BMO_\rho(\mathcal{X})$ *is the dual space of* $H^1_\rho(\mathcal{X})$*.*

3. The product of functions in $BMO(\mathcal{X})$ and $H^1(\mathcal{X})$

Remark that if $g\in\mathcal{G}(\beta,\gamma)$, then

$$\|g\|_{L^\infty}\leq C\frac{1}{V_1(x_0)}\|g\|_{\mathcal{G}(\beta,\gamma)} \tag{3.1}$$

and

$$\|g\|_{L^1}\leq(C+\sum_{j=0}^{\infty}2^{-j\gamma})\|g\|_{\mathcal{G}(\beta,\gamma)}\leq C\|g\|_{\mathcal{G}(\beta,\gamma)}. \tag{3.2}$$

Proposition 3.1. *Let $\beta \in (0,1]$ and $\gamma \in (0,\infty)$. Then, g is a pointwise multiplier of $BMO(\mathcal{X})$ for all $g \in \mathcal{G}(\beta,\gamma)$. More precisely,*

$$\|gf\|_{BMO} \le C\frac{1}{V_1(x_0)}\|g\|_{\mathcal{G}(\beta,\gamma)}\|f\|_{BMO^+}$$

for all $f \in BMO(\mathcal{X})$. Here and what in follows,

$$\|f\|_{BMO^+} := \|f\|_{BMO} + \frac{1}{V_1(x_0)}\int\limits_{B(x_0,1)} |f(x)|d\mu(x).$$

Using Proposition 3.1, for $b \in BMO(\mathcal{X})$ and $f \in H^1(\mathcal{X})$, one can define the distribution $b \times f \in (\mathcal{G}_0^\epsilon(\beta,\gamma))'$ by the rule

$$\langle b \times f, \phi\rangle := \langle \phi b, f\rangle \tag{3.3}$$

for all $\phi \in \mathcal{G}_0^\epsilon(\beta,\gamma)$, where the second bracket stands for the duality bracket between $H^1(\mathcal{X})$ and its dual $BMO(\mathcal{X})$.

Proof of Proposition 3.1. By (3.1) and the pointwise multipliers characterization of $BMO(\mathcal{X})$ (see [11, Theorem 1.1]), it is sufficient to show that

$$\log(e+1/r)MO(g,B(a,r)) \le C\frac{1}{V_1(x_0)}\|g\|_{\mathcal{G}(\beta,\gamma)} \tag{3.4}$$

and

$$\log(e+d(x_0,a)+r)MO(g,B(a,r)) \le C\frac{1}{V_1(x_0)}\|g\|_{\mathcal{G}(\beta,\gamma)} \tag{3.5}$$

hold for all balls $B(a,r) \subset \mathcal{X}$. It is easy to see that (3.4) follows from (3.1) and the Lipschitz property of g (see (ii) of Definition 2.1). Let us now establish (3.5). If $r<1$, then by (3.5) follows from the Lipschitz property of g and the fact that $\lim_{\lambda\to\infty}\frac{\log(\lambda)}{\lambda^\beta}=0$. Otherwise, we consider the following two cases:

(a) The case: $1 \le r \le \frac{1}{4\kappa^3}d(x_0,a)$. Then, for every $x,y \in B(a,r)$, one has $d(x_0,a) \le \frac{4\kappa^3}{4\kappa^2-1}$ and $d(x,y) \le \frac{d(x_0,x)}{2\kappa}$. Hence, the Lipschitz property of g yields

$$|g(x)-g(y)| \le C\|g\|_{\mathcal{G}(\beta,\gamma)}\frac{1}{V_1(x_0)}\Big(\frac{1}{d(x_0,a)}\Big)^\gamma.$$

This implies that (3.5) holds since $\lim_{\lambda\to\infty}\frac{\log(\lambda)}{\lambda^\gamma}=0$.

(b) The case: $r > \frac{1}{4\kappa^3} d(x_0, a)$. Then, one has $B(x_0, r) \subset B(a, \kappa(4\kappa^3+1)r)$. Hence, by (2.2), we get

$$\begin{aligned} \log(e + d(x_0, a) + r) MO(g, B(a, r)) &\leq C \frac{\log(2r)}{V_r(x_0)} \|g\|_{L^1} \\ &\leq C \frac{\log(2r)}{r^{\mathfrak{d}}} \frac{1}{V_1(x_0)} \|g\|_{\mathcal{G}(\beta,\gamma)} \\ &\leq C \frac{1}{V_1(x_0)} \|g\|_{\mathcal{G}(\beta,\gamma)}. \end{aligned}$$

This proves (3.5) and thus the proof of Propsition 3.1 is finished.

□

Next we define $L^{\Xi}(\mathcal{X})$ as the space of μ-measurable functions f such that

$$\int_{\mathcal{X}} \frac{e^{|f(x)|} - 1}{(1 + d(x_0, x))^{2\mathfrak{n}}} d\mu(x) < \infty.$$

Then, the norm on the space $L^{\Xi}(\mathcal{X})$ is defined by

$$\|f\|_{L^{\Xi}} = \inf \left\{ \lambda > 0 : \int_{\mathcal{X}} \frac{e^{|f(x)|/\lambda} - 1}{(1 + d(x_0, x))^{2\mathfrak{n}}} d\mu(x) \leq 1 \right\}.$$

Recall the following two lemmas due to Feuto [4].

Lemma 3.1. *For every $f \in BMO(\mathcal{X})$,*

$$\|f - f_{B(x_0,1)}\|_{L^{\Xi}} \leq C \|f\|_{BMO}.$$

Lemma 3.2. *Let $q \in (1, \infty]$. Then,*

$$\|(\mathfrak{b} - \mathfrak{b}_B)\mathcal{M}(\mathfrak{a})\|_{L^1} \leq C \|\mathfrak{b}\|_{BMO}$$

for all $\mathfrak{b} \in BMO(\mathcal{X})$ and for all (H^1, q)-atom $\mathfrak{a}$ related to the ball B.

The main point in the proof of Theorem 1.1 is the following.

Proposition 3.2. *(i) For any $f \in L^1(\mathcal{X})$ and $g \in L^{\Xi}(\mathcal{X})$, we have*

$$\|fg\|_{L^{\log}} \leq 64\mathfrak{n}^2 \|f\|_{L^1} \|g\|_{L^{\Xi}}.$$

(ii) For any $f \in L^1(\mathcal{X})$ and $g \in BMO(\mathcal{X})$, we have

$$\|fg\|_{L^{\log}} \leq C \|f\|_{L^1} \|g\|_{BMO^+}.$$

Proof. (i) If $\|f\|_{L^1} = 0$ or $\|g\|_{L^{\Xi}} = 0$, then there is nothing to prove. Otherwise, we may assume that $\|f\|_{L^1} = \|g\|_{L^{\Xi}} = \frac{1}{8\mathfrak{n}}$ since homogeneity of the norms. Then, we need to prove that

$$\int_{\mathcal{X}} \frac{|f(x)g(x)|}{\log(e + |f(x)g(x)|) + \log(e + d(x_0, x))} d\mu(x) \leq 1.$$

Indeed, by using the following two inequalities

$$\log(e+ab) \le 2(\log(e+a)+\log(e+b)),\ a,b\ge 0,$$

and

$$\frac{ab}{\log(e+ab)} \le a+(e^b-1),\ a,b\ge 0,$$

we obtain that, for every $x\in\mathcal{X}$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{(1+d(x_0,x))^{2\mathfrak{n}}|f(x)g(x)|}{4\mathfrak{n}(\log(e+|f(x)g(x)|)+\log(e+d(x_0,x)))}\\
\le\ &\frac{(1+d(x_0,x))^{2\mathfrak{n}}|f(x)g(x)|}{2(\log(e+|f(x)g(x)|)+\log(e+(1+d(x_0,x))^{2\mathfrak{n}}))}\\
\le\ &\frac{(1+d(x_0,x))^{2\mathfrak{n}}|f(x)||g(x)|}{\log(e+(1+d(x_0,x))^{2\mathfrak{n}}|f(x)||g(x)|)}\\
\le\ &(1+d(x_0,x))^{2\mathfrak{n}}|f(x)|+(e^{|g(x)|}-1).
\end{aligned}$$

This together with the fact $8\mathfrak{n}(e^{|g(x)|}-1)\le e^{8\mathfrak{n}|g(x)|}-1$ give

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{\mathcal{X}}\frac{|f(x)g(x)|}{\log(e+|f(x)g(x)|)+\log(e+d(x_0,x))}d\mu(x)\\
\le\ &4\mathfrak{n}\|f\|_{L^1}+\frac{1}{2}\int_{\mathcal{X}}\frac{e^{8\mathfrak{n}|g(x)|}-1}{(1+d(x_0,x))^{2\mathfrak{n}}}d\mu(x)\\
\le\ &\frac{1}{2}+\frac{1}{2}=1,
\end{aligned}$$

which completes the proof of (i).

(ii) It follows directly from (i) and Lemma 3.1.

□

Now we ready to give the proof for Theorem 1.1.

Proof of Theorem 1.1. By (i) of Theorem 2.1, f can be written as

$$f=\sum_{j=1}^{\infty}\lambda_j a_j$$

where the a_j's are (H^1,∞)-atoms related to the balls B_j's and $\sum_{j=1}^{\infty}|\lambda_j|\le C\|f\|_{H^1}$. Therefore, for all $b\in BMO(\mathcal{X})$, we have

$$\left\|\sum_{j=1}^{\infty}\lambda_j(b-b_{B_j})a_j\right\|_{L^1}\le\sum_{j=1}^{\infty}|\lambda_j|\|(b-b_{B_j})a_j\|_{L^1}\le C\|b\|_{BMO}\|f\|_{H^1}. \tag{3.6}$$

By this and Definition (3.3), we see that the series $\sum_{j=1}^{\infty}\lambda_j b_{B_j}a_j$ converges to $b\times f-\sum_{j=1}^{\infty}\lambda_j(b-b_{B_j})a_j$ in $(\mathcal{G}_0^{\epsilon}(\beta,\gamma))'$. Consequently, if we define the

decomposition operators as

$$\mathscr{L}_f(b) = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \lambda_j (b - b_{B_j}) a_j$$

and

$$\mathscr{H}_f(b) = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \lambda_j b_{B_j} a_j,$$

where the sums are in $(\mathcal{G}_0^\epsilon(\beta,\gamma))'$, then it is clear that $\mathscr{L}_f : BMO(\mathcal{X}) \to L^1(\mathcal{X})$ is a bounded linear operator, since (3.6), and for every $b \in BMO(\mathcal{X})$,

$$b \times f = \mathscr{L}_f(b) + \mathscr{H}_f(b).$$

Now we only need to prove that the distribution $\mathscr{H}_f(b)$ is in $H^{\log}(\mathcal{X})$. Indeed, by Lemma 3.2 and (ii) of Proposition 3.2, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathcal{M}(\mathscr{H}_f(b))\|_{L^{\log}} &\leq \left\| \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} |\lambda_j| |b_{B_j}| \mathcal{M}(a_j) \right\|_{L^{\log}} \\ &\leq \left\| \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} |\lambda_j| |b - b_{B_j}| \mathcal{M}(a_j) \right\|_{L^1} + \left\| b \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} |\lambda_j| \mathcal{M}(a_j) \right\|_{L^{\log}} \\ &\leq C \|f\|_{H^1} \|b\|_{BMO^+}. \end{aligned}$$

This proves that $\mathscr{H}_f$ is bounded from $BMO(\mathcal{X})$ into $H^{\log}(\mathcal{X})$, and thus ends the proof of Theorem 1.1.

□

4. The product of functions in $BMO_\rho(\mathcal{X})$ and $H^1_\rho(\mathcal{X})$

For $f \in BMO_\rho(\mathcal{X})$, a standard argument gives

$$\|f\|_{BMO^+} \leq C \log(\rho(x_0) + 1/\rho(x_0)) \|f\|_{BMO_\rho}. \tag{4.1}$$

Proposition 4.1. *Let $\beta \in (0,1]$ and $\gamma \in (0,\infty)$. Then, g is a pointwise multiplier of $BMO_\rho(\mathcal{X})$ for all $g \in \mathcal{G}(\beta,\gamma)$. More precisely, for every $f \in BMO_\rho(\mathcal{X})$,*

$$\|gf\|_{BMO_\rho} \leq C \frac{\log(\rho(x_0) + 1/\rho(x_0))}{V_1(x_0)} \|g\|_{\mathcal{G}(\beta,\gamma)} \|f\|_{BMO_\rho}.$$

Proof. By Proposition 3.1, (4.1) and (3.1), we get

$$\begin{aligned} \|gf\|_{BMO_\rho} &\leq \|gf\|_{BMO} + \|g\|_{L^\infty} \sup_{B \in \mathcal{D}} \frac{1}{\mu(B)} \int_B |f(x)| d\mu(x) \\ &\leq C \frac{\log(\rho(x_0) + 1/\rho(x_0))}{V_1(x_0)} \|g\|_{\mathcal{G}(\beta,\gamma)} \|f\|_{BMO_\rho}. \end{aligned}$$

□

Using Proposition 4.1, for $b \in BMO_\rho(\mathcal{X})$ and $f \in H^1_\rho(\mathcal{X})$, one can define the distribution $b \times f \in (\mathcal{G}_0^\epsilon(\beta,\gamma))'$ by the rule

$$\langle b \times f, \phi \rangle := \langle \phi b, f \rangle \tag{4.2}$$

for all $\phi \in \mathcal{G}_0^\epsilon(\beta,\gamma)$, where the second bracket stands for the duality bracket between $H^1_\rho(\mathcal{X})$ and its dual $BMO_\rho(\mathcal{X})$.

Proof of Theorem 1.2. By (ii) of Theorem 2.1, there exist a sequence of (H^1_ρ,∞)-atoms $\{a_j\}_{j=1}^\infty$ related to the sequence of balls $\{B(x_j,r_j)\}_{j=1}^\infty$ and $\sum_{j=1}^\infty |\lambda_j| \le C\|f\|_{H^1_\rho}$ such that

$$f = \sum_{j=1}^\infty \lambda_j a_j = f_1 + f_2,$$

where $f_1 = \sum_{r_j<\rho(x_j)} \lambda_j a_j \in H^1(\mathcal{X})$ and $f_2 = \sum_{r_j\ge\rho(x_j)} \lambda_j a_j$.

We define the decomposition operators as following

$$\mathscr{L}_{\rho,f}(b) = \mathscr{L}_{f_1}(b) + bf_2$$

and

$$\mathscr{H}_{\rho,f}(b) = \mathscr{H}_{f_1}(b),$$

where the operators $\mathscr{L}_{f_1}$ and $\mathscr{H}_{f_1}$ are as in Theorem 1.1. Then, Theorem 1.1 together with (4.1) give

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\mathscr{L}_{\rho,f}(b)\|_{L^1} &\le \|\mathscr{L}_{f_1}(b)\|_{L^1} + \sum_{r_j\ge\rho(x_j)} |\lambda_j| \|ba_j\|_{L^1} \\
&\le C\|f_1\|_{H^1}\|b\|_{BMO} + C\|b\|_{BMO_\rho} \sum_{r_j\ge\rho(x_j)} |\lambda_j| \\
&\le C\|f\|_{H^1_\rho}\|b\|_{BMO_\rho}
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\|\mathscr{H}_{\rho,f}(b)\|_{H^{\log}} \le C\|f_1\|_{H^1}\|b\|_{BMO^+} \le C\|f\|_{H^1_\rho}\|b\|_{BMO_\rho}.$$

This proves that the linear operator $\mathscr{L}_{\rho,f} : BMO_\rho(\mathcal{X}) \to L^1(\mathcal{X})$ is bounded and the linear operator $\mathscr{H}_{\rho,f} : BMO_\rho(\mathcal{X}) \to H^{\log}(\mathcal{X})$ is bounded. Moreover,

$$\begin{aligned}
b \times f &= b \times f_1 + b \times f_2 \\
&= (\mathscr{L}_{f_1}(b) + \mathscr{H}_{f_1}(b)) + bf_2 \\
&= \mathscr{L}_{\rho,f}(b) + \mathscr{H}_{\rho,f}(b),
\end{aligned}$$

which ends the proof of Theorem 1.2.

□

References

[1] A. Bonami, S. Grellier and L. D. Ky, Paraproducts and products of functions in $BMO(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and $\mathcal{H}^1(\mathbb{R}^n)$ through wavelets. J. Math. Pures Appl. (9) 97 (2012), no. 3, 230–241.

[2] A. Bonami, T. Iwaniec, P. Jones and M. Zinsmeister, On the product of functions in BMO and H^1. Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble) 57 (2007), no. 5, 1405–1439.

[3] R. R. Coifman and G. Weiss, Extensions of Hardy spaces and their use in analysis. Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. 83 (1977), no. 4, 569–645.

[4] J. Feuto, Products of functions in BMO and $\mathcal{H}^1$ spaces on spaces of homogeneous type. J. Math. Anal. Appl. 359 (2009), no. 2, 610–620.

[5] L. Grafakos, L. Liu and D. Yang, Maximal function characterizations of Hardy sapces on RD-spaces and their applications, Sci. China Ser. A 51 (2008), 2253–2284.

[6] L. Grafakos, L. Liu and D. Yang, Radial maximal function characterizations for Hardy spaces on RD-spaces. Bull. Soc. Math. France 137 (2009), no. 2, 225–251.

[7] Y. Han, D. Müller and D. Yang, A theory of Besov and Triebel-Lizorkin spaces on metric measure spaces modeled on Carnot-Carathéodory spaces. Abstr. Appl. Anal. 2008, Art. ID 893409, 250 pp.

[8] L. D. Ky, New Hardy spaces of Musielak-Orlicz type and boundedness of sublinear operators. Integral Equations Operator Theory 78 (2014), no. 1, 115–150.

[9] L. D. Ky, Bilinear decompositions for the product space $H^1_L \times BMO_L$, Math. Nachr. (2014), DOI: 10.1002/mana.201200101.

[10] P. Li and L. Peng, The decomposition of product space $H^1_L \times \mathrm{BMO}_L$. J. Math. Anal. Appl. 349 (2009), no. 2, 484–492.

[11] E. Nakai, Pointwise multipliers on weighted BMO spaces. Studia Math. 125 (1997), no. 1, 35–56.

[12] D. Yang, D. Yang and Y. Zhou, Localized Morrey-Campanato spaces on metric measure spaces and applications to Schrödinger operators. Nagoya Math. J. 198 (2010), 77–119.

[13] D. Yang and Y. Zhou, Localized Hardy spaces H^1 related to admissible functions on RD-spaces and applications to Schrödinger operators. Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 363 (2011), no. 3, 1197–1239.

Department of Mathematics, University of Quy Nhon, 170 An Duong Vuong, Quy Nhon, Binh Dinh, Viet Nam

E-mail address: dangky@math.cnrs.fr